closing date, except as provided in section 15(e);

(b) The application for a written agreement must contain all variable terms of the contract between you and us that will be in effect if the written agreement is not approved;

(c) If approved, the written agreement will include all variable terms of the contract, including, but not limited to, crop type or variety, and premium rate;

(d) Each written agreement will only be valid for one year (If the written agreement is not specifically renewed the following year, insurance coverage for subsequent crop years will be in accordance with the printed policy); and

(e) An application for a written agreement submitted after the sales closing date may be approved if, after a physical inspection of the acreage, it is determined that no loss has occurred and the crop is insurable in accordance with the policy and written agreement provisions.

16. Minimum Value Option

(a) The provisions of this option are continuous and will be attached to and made a part of your insurance policy, if:

(1) You elect *either* Option I *or* Option II of the Minimum Value Option on your application, or on a form approved by us, on or before the sales closing date for the initial crop year in which you wish to insure fresh market peppers under this option, and pay the additional premium indicated in the Actuarial Table for this optional coverage; and

(2) You have not elected coverage under the Catastrophic Risk Protection Endorsement.

(b) In lieu of the provisions contained in section 14(c)(3), the total value of harvested production will be determined as follows:

(1) If you selected Option I of the Minimum Value Option, the total value of harvested production will be as follows:

(i) For sold production, the dollar amount obtained by subtracting the allowable cost contained in the Special Provisions from the price received for each box of peppers (this result may not be less than the minimum value option price contained in the Special Provisions for any box of peppers), and multiplying this result by the number of boxes of peppers sold; and

(ii) For marketable production that is not sold, the dollar amount obtained by multiplying the number of boxes of such peppers on the unit by the minimum value shown in the Special Provisions for the planting period (harvested production that is damaged or defective due to insurable causes and is not marketable will not be counted as production).

(2) If you selected Option II of the Minimum Value Option, the total value of harvested production will be as provided in section 16(b)(1), except that the dollar amount specified in section 16(b)(1)(i) may not be less than zero.

(c) This option may be canceled by either you or us for any succeeding crop year by giving written notice on or before the cancellation date preceding the crop year for which the cancellation of this option is to be effective.

Signed in Washington, DC, on March 24, 1997.

Kenneth D. Ackerman,

Manager, Federal Crop Insurance.

[FR Doc. 97–7941 Filed 3–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–FA–P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

12 CFR Part 265

[Docket No. R–0968]

Rules Regarding Delegation of Authority

AGENCY: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board) is delegating to an individual member the Board's authority to approve extensions of the 180-day period for final Board action on applications to establish certain foreign bank offices in the United States. This delegation of authority is intended to aid in the efficient processing of such foreign bank office applications.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 22, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul A. Vogel, Senior Attorney (202/452–3428), Sara M. Craig, Attorney (202/452–2263), Legal Division, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. For the hearing impaired only, Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TDD), contact Dorthea Thompson (202/452–3544), Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 20th and C Streets, NW, Washington, DC 20551.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 7(d) of the International Banking Act of 1978 (IBA), as amended by the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996 (Pub. L. No. 104–208, 110 Stat. 26), permits the Board to extend the 180-day period within which the Board must take final action on an application by a foreign bank to establish a U.S. branch or agency or to acquire ownership or control of a commercial lending company in the United States. The Board may extend this period an additional 180 days after providing notice of, and the reasons for, the extension to the applicant foreign bank and to the State bank supervisor or the Comptroller of the Currency, as appropriate (12 U.S.C. 3105(d)(7)(A)).

The Board has delegated to an individual Board member the authority to approve such extensions pursuant to section 7(d) of the IBA. Section 11(k) of the Federal Reserve Act provides that the Board is authorized and empowered to delegate any of its functions, other than those relating to rulemaking or pertaining principally to monetary and credit policies, to one or more administrative law judges, members or employees of the Board, or Federal Reserve banks. 12 U.S.C. 248(k). This delegation of authority is consistent with previous Board practices with respect to extensions of time periods mandated by Regulation K.

The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA)(5 U.S.C. 553) relating to notice, public participation, and deferred effective date have not been followed in connection with the adoption of this amendment because the change to be effected is procedural in nature and does not constitute a substantive rule subject to the requirements of that section. The APA grants a specific exemption from its requirements relating to notice and public participation in this instance (12 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(A)), and good cause exists to find that the nature of this amendment makes a notice and public comment procedure unnecessary.

Regulatory Flexibility Act Analysis

Pursuant to the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–612), the Board hereby certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995

In accordance with section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Ch. 35; 5 CFR part 1320 Appendix A.1), the Board reviewed the rule under the authority delegated to the Board by the Office of Management and Budget. No collections of information pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act are contained in the rule.

List of Subjects in 12 CFR Part 265

Authority delegations (Government agencies), Banks, banking, Federal Reserve System.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Board amends 12 CFR part 265 as set forth below:

PART 265—RULES REGARDING DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

1. The authority citation for Part 265 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 12 U.S.C. 248 (i) and (k).

2. Section 265.4 is amended by adding paragraph (a)(4) to read as follows:

§ 265.4 Functions delegated to Board members.

(a) * * *

(4) *Extension of time period for final Board action.* To extend for an additional 180 days the 180-day period within which final Board action is required on an application pursuant to section 7(d) of the International Banking Act.

* * * * *

By order of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 24, 1997.

William W. Wiles,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 97–7910 Filed 3–27–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 96–NM–107–AD; Amendment 39–9975; AD 97–07–02]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This amendment adopts a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Airbus Model A300 series airplanes. It requires a one-time template inspection of the rear pressure bulkhead to detect dents; repetitive eddy current inspections of dents greater than a certain depth to detect cracking; and repair, if necessary. This amendment is prompted by a report indicating that cracking has been found in the vicinity of a dent in the rear pressure bulkhead of one airplane. The actions specified by this amendment are intended to prevent fatigue cracking resulting from a dent in the rear pressure bulkhead; that condition, if not corrected, could reduce the structural integrity of the bulkhead and, consequently, lead to rapid depressurization of the airplane.

DATES: Effective May 2, 1997.

The incorporation by reference of certain publications listed in the regulations is approved by the Director of the Federal Register as of May 2, 1997.

ADDRESSES: The service information referenced in this AD may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, Rules Docket, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., suite 700, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tim Backman, Aerospace Engineer, Standardization Branch, ANM–113, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055–4056; telephone (206) 227–2797; fax (206) 227–1149.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to certain Airbus Model A300 series airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** on November 5, 1996 (61 FR 56923). That action proposed to require a one-time template inspection of the rear pressure bulkhead to detect dents; repetitive eddy current inspections of dented areas greater than a certain depth to detect fatigue cracking; and repair, if necessary.

Interested persons have been afforded an opportunity to participate in the making of this amendment. Due consideration has been given to the comments received.

Support for the Proposal

One commenter supports the proposed AD.

Request to Explain Adequacy of One-Time Inspection

One commenter asks if a one-time inspection, as would be required by the AD, is adequate to address the subject fatigue cracking. The commenter points out that if the inspection finds no dents of a depth greater than 2 mm, no further action would be required; consequently, any subsequent detection of dents/cracking will depend upon the existing level and frequency of inspections in the operators' existing maintenance program, specifically the Maintenance Planning Document (MPD). The commenter questions whether the inspections scheduled under the current MPD are adequate to ensure that any small dents are subsequently found and corrected in a timely manner.

The FAA responds to this comment by reiterating the circumstances relevant to the cracking addressed by this AD action. The subject cracks were detected on the rear pressure bulkhead on one airplane during a heavy maintenance check. The cracks were found to initiate from a dent in the bulkhead. Airbus conducted analyses and calculations of the dent and associated cracking, which demonstrated that:

1. The force necessary to make a dent of this sort in the rear pressure bulkhead in the specific location could not have been generated in service, and

2. The dent was unique to the production process.

The purpose of the one-time inspection required by this AD is to detect dents as small as 2mm in depth in the rear pressure bulkhead that may have occurred during production. To accomplish this, the inspection makes use of a template in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A300–53–302, because the inspections conducted under the MPD cannot detect small dents of this type. The inspections that are part of the MPD are visual inspections, and are considered adequate to detect defects of the rear pressure bulkhead that may occur in service.

Conclusion

After careful review of the available data, including the comments noted above, the FAA has determined that air safety and the public interest require the adoption of the rule as proposed.

Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 15 Airbus Model A300 series airplanes of U.S. registry will be affected by this AD, that it will take approximately 5 work hours per airplane to accomplish the required inspection for denting, and that the average labor rate is $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $4,500, or $300 per airplane.

If subsequent eddy current inspections to detect cracking are necessary, they would require 46 work hours per airplane to accomplish, at an average labor rate of $60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of these inspections on U.S. operators is estimated to be $2,760 per airplane per inspection.

The cost impact figures discussed above are based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

Regulatory Impact

The regulations adopted herein will not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this final rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.